

## **REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application, with Claims 1 and 6 being independent. Claims 1 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey (WO 00/69190) in view of Alisobhani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,760,393) and further in view of Hamalainen (U.S. Patent 5,966,378). Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dailey (WO 00/69190) in view of Alisobhani and Hamalainen, and further in view of Ohashi (U.S. Patent) 6,467,059).

Please amend Claim 1 as set forth herein.

It is respectfully asserted that Dailey only discloses transmitting a message between a called MS and a caller MS, but it fails to disclose transmitting a message between a caller MS and a called MS connected to a base station identical to the base station to which the caller MS belongs, as set forth in paragraph a) of Claim 1 and paragraphs a) through b) of Claim 6.

Further, although the Examiner alleges that Alisobhani discloses adding a header to data and transmitting the data including the header, Alsobhani discloses that an address is contained in actual user data, i.e. the user data itself to be transmitted. In contrast, Claim 1 as amended recites adding to the data, a header indicating a receiver of the corresponding data, namely the called MS, and transmitting the data including the header to the at least two MSs. Moreover, Hamalainen discloses informing whether the called MS supports a half-duplex data communication whenever logging on a network, while in the present claims, there is only a need to inform the network one time of whether the called MS supports a half-duplex data communication when being registered.

In other words, the present claims recite informing the network of whether the half-duplex data communication is supported when being registered to the network, and when the caller MS requests to connect the half-duplex data in the network, determining directly whether

the half-duplex data connection of the called MS is supported referring to previously stored information. On the contrary, Hamalainen is not able to inform the base station or SGSN of whether the half-duplex data communication of the called MS is supported or not, unless the called MS is logged on the network. Therefore, in Hamalainen, a confirmation cannot be immediately made as to whether or not the called MS supports the half-duplex data connection, in response to a request of connection from the caller MS, as taught in the present claims. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the 103(a) rejection of Claims 1 and 6 is obviated, and should be withdrawn. Withdrawal of the same is respectfully requested.

In view of the arguments above, it is respectfully submitted that the 103(a) rejection of Claims 2-5 should also be withdrawn, and further, since Ohashi fails to cure the stated deficiencies in Dailey, Alisobhani and Hamalainen. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 2-5 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claims 1 and 6 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2-5, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on amended independent Claim 1. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2-5 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, Claims 1-6 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written over the typed name.

Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/RCC/dr